UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Policy of UNITY - - *Curtis W. Reese*

Humanism and the Present Religious Horizon—Part I - - - *A. Stiernotte*

Mussolini Muscles In - - - - - - - *Devere Allen and E. Dixwell Chase*

A Pilgrimage of Peace - - *Henry Carter*

Futility - - - - - *Carl Peterson*

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 11

Chicago, August 5, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDTORIAL—
Notes 163
ARTICLES—
The Policy of UNITY—CURTIS W. REESE 166
Humanism and the Present Religious Horizon—Part I—A. STIERNOTTE 166
Mussolini Muscles In—DEVERE ALLEN and E. DIXWELL CHASE 169
A Pilgrimage of Peace—HENRY CARTER 170
Futility—CARL PETERSON 171
On the Pacifist Front—XIX 173
POETRY—
The Only Man—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 165
To the Conquerors—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 174
TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
No Empire's Raucous Voice—RALPH CHEYNEY 172
Width of a Line—ETHEL FAIRFIELD WHITE 172
Ninth Episode from the Parade of the Dead Soldiers—ROBERT ATWOOD 172
CORRESPONDENCE—
Jenkin Lloyd Jones and the Present Editor ..... LEO KAUL ..... 175; HELEN SWIFT NEILSON ..... 175; MARGARET T. OLMSTEAD ..... 175; ONE OF THE NINE 176
A Friend Is Through—GEORGE W. TURNER 176
Christian Principles—KATHLEEN W. SAYRE 176
THE FIELD—
Platform Adopted by Democratic National Convention 162

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Platform Adopted by Democratic National Convention

(Excerpts on Civil Liberties)

Report of Committee on Resolutions and Platform

I. We Must Strengthen Democracy Against Aggression

We do not regard the need for preparedness a warrant for infringement upon our "civil liberties," but on the contrary we shall continue to protect them, in the keen realization that the vivid contrast between the freedom we enjoy and the dark repression which prevails in the lands where liberty is dead, affords warning and example to our people to confirm their faith in democracy.

II. We Must Strengthen Democracy by Increasing Our Economic Efficiency

1. Industry and the Worker

We pledge to continue to enforce fair labor standards; to *maintain the principles of the National Labor Relations Act;* to expand employment, training and opportunity for our youth, older workers, and workers displaced by technological changes; to *strengthen the orderly processes of collective bargaining and peaceful settlement of labor disputes;* and to work always for a just distribution of our national income among those who labor.

We will continue our efforts to achieve equality of opportunity for men and women without impairing the social legislation which promotes true equality by safeguarding the health, safety and economic welfare of women workers. The right to work for compensation in both public and private employment is an inalienable privilege of women as well as men, without distinction as to marital status.

5. Radio

Radio has become an integral part of the democratically accepted doctrine of freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion. We urge such legislative steps as may be required to afford the same protection from censorship that is now afforded the press under the Constitution of the United States.

III. We Must Strengthen Democracy by Improving the Welfare of the People

7. Negroes

We shall continue to strive for complete legislative safeguards against discrimination in government service and benefits, and in the national defense forces. We pledge to uphold the due process and the equal protection of laws for every citizen, regardless of race, creed or color.

IV. Our Democratic Faith

Democracy is more than a political system for the government of a people. It is the expression of a people's faith in themselves as human beings. If this faith is permitted to die, human progress will die with it. We believe that a mechanized existence, lacking the spiritual quality of democracy, is intolerable to the free people of this country.

We therefore pledge ourselves to fight, as our fathers fought, for the right of every American to enjoy freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, petition, and security in his home.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, AUGUST 5, 1940 No. 11

PACIFISM

"Our gospel is as old, true and solid as the hills. Violence and force have been tried again and again, and have always failed, because such action is based on the foolish belief that evil may be overcome by evil."

George Lansbury.

THE CONVENTIONS

Well, the Republicans and the Democrats have held their conventions, and we have now the presidential line-up—Earl Browder for the Communists, Norman Thomas for the Socialists, Roger Babson for the Prohibitionists, Wendell L. Willkie for the Republicans, and Franklin D. Roosevelt for the Democrats. The vice-presidential line-up—we challenge any and all of our readers to name it! The two latest and most important conventions, in Philadelphia and Chicago, had striking similarities. There was the same empty and bombastic oratory, with no Republican sinking so low as Senator Barkley in his demogogic utterance as Permanent Chairman of the Democratic Convention, and no Republican rising as high as Mrs. Roosevelt in her gem of an address. There were the same artificial, tiresome, and inane "demonstrations" for this candidate and that. There were the same verbose and meaningless platforms, laboriously prepared, heedlessly read, immediately forgotten, ultimately to be ignored or utterly defied. There was the same politics behind the scenes, and the same stunt showmanship out in front. Curiously, there was in both conventions the same breaking of party lines—the Republicans choosing a former Democrat as their presidential candidate, and the Democrats choosing a former Republican for their vice-presidential candidate. Impressively, also, there was in both conventions a smacking defeat of old-line boss rule by a determined public opinion; Mr. Willkie was named not because the Republican party leaders wanted him but because the people were determined to have him, and Mr. Roosevelt was named in defiance of the Democratic party machine by the power of New Dealers backed by great masses of the people. There is similarity also in these candidates. Mr. Willkie and Mr. Roosevelt both have personal charm, magnetism, attractive radio speech, and astounding popularity. The campaign between them will be a real campaign—the first which Mr. Roosevelt has encountered in his career. Hitherto, the President has had it all his own way; Mr. Hoover was beaten in 1932 before he started, and Governor Landon was a hopeless contender against the champion of the New Deal. But this time it will be different—Mr. Roosevelt will be meeting a man of his own mettle! The matter of issues, and the relation of the candidates thereto, we shall discuss as the campaign proceeds. Meanwhile, unlike many Americans these days, we do not deplore but eagerly rejoice in the fierce political contention before us. It is reassuring to us to witness, in this totalitarian age, a first-class demonstration of democracy at work among a free people.

RUSSIA ON THE RAMPAGE

In all the vast pity and horror of the tragedy of France, one has scarcely had time to note that Russia has been getting away with murder. At the very moment when Hitler was getting his stranglehold on the Republic and swiftly choking her to death, Russia let loose her bandit hordes in Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania, and took over these three helpless countries; then followed this outrage by her ultimatum to Roumania appropriating Bessarabia. Of course there was the usual bunk about "protective occupation"—Stalin was coming to the aid of these nations as Hitler came to the aid of Norway, Belgium, and Holland! But the process was in each case an ultimatum, an invasion, and a conquest—and Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, by fake process of election, are now definitely annexed to the Russian empire. Before these lines are published, Finland may be added to the loot thus wantonly seized by the "red" army. The diplomatic significance of these conquests is occasion for speculation. Is Stalin alarmed by Hitler's victories, and is he preparing for a break with his new and embarrassingly successful ally? We are no expert in these matters, and have no knowledge which would make our speculations of any worth. What interests us as of immediate and fundamental importance is this latest and utterly conclusive exposure of the real character of Soviet Russia these days. If there could have been any doubt after Finland, there can be no doubt now, that Russia is an empire precisely of the traditional type, using military power to get everything she can lay her hands on, in defiance of every principle of justice, liberty, and peace. The

rights and interests of the people, the proletariat, the workers, mean no more to Moscow than to Berlin, or Rome, or Tokio. Just as Italy came into the war at just the moment to get her share of the dismemberment of France, and Japan intervened to take over the French holdings in Asia, so Soviet Russia set her gangster troopers in motion to seize all the little countries within her reach. It is a shameless and cruel game, but Stalin plays it for all it is worth. And there are those who still see in Russia, and in Communism, the hope of the world!

VALE, FRANCE

The Republic of France has suffered a double defeat. The first is military, the second moral; the former involuntary, the latter voluntary. The military defeat may perhaps be pardoned, though one stands aghast at experts and commanders who knew so little of the weapons and tactics of the enemy, and at statesmen who were willing to go to war with such light-hearted irresponsibility. After all, disaster has come full often upon the field of battle, and not always to the disgrace of the vanquished—as witness the willingness to save Paris, and France, by ending useless slaughter. But what are we to say about the moral defeat—the deliberate destruction of the Third Republic at the hands of France's own leaders, and the joining of the nation to the Fascist bloc of Europe? Of course, France after the armistice was not a free agent. This may explain a lot of things—the surrender, or rather attempted surrender of the fleet, the return of the four hundred captured German aviators, even the agreement to pass over into the tender hands of the Nazis the German exiles who had taken refuge in France from Hitler's tyranny. The Republic was bargaining for its life, and therefore had to submit to dictated terms. But this does not explain the work of making France over into a Fascist state! The Republic, as we have said, was bargaining for its life, and life for France is "Liberté, Egalité, and Fraternité." The very heart of the Republic is freedom—and this heart has been cut out by Laval, Petain, and Weygand. It may be said that this also was a part of the dictated terms of peace. But was it?—where is the evidence? And even so, why did Frenchmen not only consent to this act of suicide and treason, but themselves consummate it? In saying this, we are not arguing that a war should have been continued which we now know should never have been begun. There are other alternatives! Thus, these Frenchmen might have refused to destroy the Republic, as the German commissioner at Versailles in 1919 refused to sign the dictated treaty placed before him by Clemenceau *et al.* They might have gone into exile, like King Haakon, of Norway, and carried with them their government and honor. They might even have died, as they made hundreds of thousands of innocent Frenchmen to die—for nothing. But, no! They chose to make France into the likeness of their conqueror. From a military defeat France might have risen, as she has risen before. But from this moral defeat, what recovery is there?

MEN WHO LIVE TOO LONG

The tragedy of untimely death is one of the supreme tragedies of human life. Keats died at 26; had he lived, he might have been another Shakespeare. Mozart died at 35, already one of the great composers of all time; what would he have done had he lived to the age of Beethoven or Wagner? Pitt the Younger died at 47; think of what changes he might have wrought in Napoleonic Europe, had he lived to the age of his distinguished father, the Earl of Chatham! But there is another tragedy—not so great perhaps, but certainly more pitiful. It is the tragedy of men who live too long—who should have died early rather than late. Benedict Arnold is a classic and terrible example. Think of the difference in this man's reputation had he been killed, instead of only badly wounded, at the battle of Saratoga! He would undoubtedly have ranked only second to Washington among the military heroes of the Revolutionary War. Daniel Webster's memory would have been far happier had be died before rather than after his 7th of March speech. Marshal Hindenburg should never have lived to pass days of senility as President of the German Republic, and, as his final act, to receive Hitler into the chancellorship. And now to the list of these tragic figures who outlived their usefulness and honor must be added the name of Marshal Petain, of France. This great military leader was in the full ascension of his glory in 1916 at Verdun, when he heroically defended France's central citadel against all attack. He should have died in the flood-tide of that struggle—or lived only so long after as to enjoy the triumph accorded to his deeds. As fate would have it, however, he lingered to our time, to play the tragic role of traitor to the France he had served so well. Not that he made peace—but that he used peace to destroy the Republic by making it over into a Fascist dictatorship! Such work might well have been anticipated from Laval, but not from Petain. The pity of it is that, as long as history is written, Verdun will be forgotten and only Vichy remembered. Yes, Petain, like many a tragic figure before him, has lived too long!

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

When we first read the Burke-Wadsworth Compulsory Selective Military Service Bill, we laughed in a cynical sort of way, and put this extraordinary piece of legislation in the category of panic ideas. It was one more phase of that storm of hysteria, centering over Washington, which nobody in his senses would take seriously. But we have had a rude awakening! The Bill *is* being taken seriously. Hearings have been held

by Senate and House. The War Department and of course the American Legion are supporting it vigorously. Not only soldiers and professional patrioteers but men of the standing of President Conant of Harvard and newspapers of the influence of the New York *Times* are for it. Correspondents are talking about the measure being passed within the next month. Of course if it goes through, the President, chief war fanatic of the day, will sign it. So this is no time for laughter, cynical or otherwise, for any man who loves America and would see this democracy survive the mania of this hour. Hence our satisfaction when we read the "Declaration Against Conscription" put forth by the Committee on Militarism in Education, and signed by 240 educators, writers, clergymen, and professional and business men. The "Declaration" describes the Burke-Wadsworth Bill as "highly dangerous to the spirit and traditions of American democracy," for four reasons: first, "the essential idea underlying military conscription is the major premise of . . . totalitarianism—that the individual citizen is but a pawn in the hands of unlimited state power"; secondly, "peacetime conscription is in itself a flagrant negation of democracy," since it sacrifices the idea of "liberty" to that degraded type of "equality which prevails among regimented galley-slaves . . . and is no more democratic than any other form of involuntary servitude"; thirdly, "the adoption of military conscription in peacetime would be a radical departure from historic American tradition"; and, finally, it would cause a "disruption in our American way of life . . . resulting in widespread dislocation in business, industry, agriculture, and higher education" without any "necessity or wisdom as a defense measure." This argument against conscription UNITY adopts *in toto*. The Burke-Wadsworth Bill is a surrender to Adolf Hitler before the fighting begins. If this sort of thing goes on, Hitler will have conquered America without sending a soldier or a bomb across the seas.

BELIEVE IT OR NOT!

Is the war mania getting us in this country? Listen! * * * In West Orange, New Jersey, a man who said, "They do things better over there" was set upon, beaten, and arrested. The judge put him on indefinite parole, and now requires him every Saturday morning to come to the court, stand at attention, and salute the flag. The judge states that this is "not a punishment but a privilege." * * * Two boys, fourteen and fifteen years of age respectively, stole an airplane, and, although they had never flown before, got the machine into the air, and crashed. They were on their way to Canada to join the R. A. F. * * * Fourteen girl students of Gulf Park College, at Gulfport, Mississippi, have enrolled in a special aviation course in their own national defense program. The girls, attractively clothed in "shorts," will be taught by the college president, Dr. Richard G. Cox. * * * The United States Congress is considering the passage of a universal peacetime conscription measure, enrolling all citizens from eighteen to sixty-five years of age (see preceding editorial) * * * The National Security League has begun registering women for war service. * * * The Bunker Hill Post of the United American Veterans has started gas-mask drills in Somerville, Massachusetts. * * * A spy and sabotage scare swept Westchester County, New York, and routed out police to save the Kensico and Croton reservoirs from bombing, as excited residents discovered a balloon flying low at a late hour of the night. After all the excitement, it was discovered and verified that the Nazi balloon belonged to the U. S. Navy, and was engaged in a trial flight. * * * The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been examining the record of Senator Gerald P. Nye, in search of pro-Nazi sympathies. * * * President Ruthven, of the University of Michigan, has expelled six student members of the American Student Union as "disturbing influences," and Governor Heil, of Wisconsin, has asked the State University to ban "subversive" students. * * * In Philadelphia, the *Inquirer* has launched a campaign against fifty-eight school teachers who signed nominating petitions for the Communist Party. * * * In Memphis, on the occasion of the convention of the Newspaper Guild, a Negro high school drum-and-bugle corps was forbidden to parade because the chief of police thought "these niggers were Communistic enough" as it is. * * * So it goes! And it is under the influence of this crazy spirit of mingled fear and hate that this country is determining its destiny. God save America!

The Only Man

Whoever you are; whatever you do,
The "Man" in me is the "Man" in you.
It matters not our station or name
The "Man" in us is one and the same.

To this great truth let none be blind
That the only "Man" is all mankind.
Nothing beyond and nothing above!
Nothing more worthy our reverent love!

The "Man" that we all are destined to be
Waits now to be born in you and me.
Yea, this is the day of His holy birth
The son of the Sun, His mother the Earth!

We to His greatness shall add our part
Mind of our mind and heart of our heart.
Nourished and strengthened from day to day
By the power of love that in us holds sway.

No dream of ours can be more sublime
Than we to become in Him divine.
All that is noblest in us to give—
We to perish that "Man" may live!

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

The Policy of UNITY

CURTIS W. REESE

There should be no misunderstanding on the part of anybody about the policy of UNITY, viz., that of *an independent journal of religiously motivated liberal opinion.* This policy grew out of the very soil of the liberal religious tradition in which the *Pamphlet Mission,* as UNITY was originally called, was established; it has been cultivated by all who have had any major part in its maintenance; and today it is as secure as any human policy can be.

It is not surprising that many people do not agree with this policy, for at no time have there been many genuinely liberal-minded people in existence. The tendency on the part of most people is to be dogmatic on some particular point of view. Even so-called liberals often identify their particular point of view with liberalism itself, and so become illiberal "liberals."

It would help to understand the policy of UNITY if people understood that the liberal movement has a history involving a spirit and a method: the spirit of free inquiry and tolerant attitudes; the method of objective observation, rational analysis, and experimental tests. For a liberal journal such as UNITY the corollary of this liberal philosophy is a policy of free discussion of all sides of the most controversial issues, limited only by high standards of honesty, competence, and proportion. The temptation is often very great to cast aside this policy and to proceed by way of either materialistic or spiritualistic shortcuts to quick solutions of complicated problems. This is particularly true in time of stress.

More specifically, the editor and the managing editor of UNITY, like the minister in a free pulpit, are free to express their opinions and their deepest convictions. But neither is able to commit the other on any particular view, as, for example, the best way to achieve a lasting peace, or to maintain democracy, or to defeat Hitler. Nor can the editors commit the Publication Committee to a policy that would close the columns of UNITY to the free expression of sincere and competent opinion. And it is the duty of the editors not to allow the columns of UNITY to be used for ulterior purposes under the guise of freedom, and so seem to commit UNITY to programs to which it is not in fact committed.

To people who do not understand liberal journalism, nor the spirit of the liberal movement, it appears strange that the editor and the managing editor can maintain in UNITY divergent positions on pacifism; and that writers in the columns may do likewise. The editor holds that "the power of the spirit, and this only, would we use against Hitler." The managing editor holds that all available and effective "moral and materiel strength" should be used to resist Nazi aggression and expansion. Both positions are honestly, and I trust competently held; and so properly belong in the columns of a liberal journal.

In the columns of UNITY in recent months we have printed letters from non-pacifists criticizing the editor for allegedly differing from the former editor, Jenkin Lloyd Jones; and we have printed letters from pacifists criticizing the managing editor in precisely the same terms. The truth of the matter is that neither the editor nor the managing editor is in precise agreement with Mr. Jones. And Mr. Jones would be the last man in the world to expect or want such agreement. He was a man of independent judgment, and he respected others who exercised similar independence of judgment. While Mr. Jones was an uncompromising opponent of war, and as such is properly called a pacifist, he was not a non-resistant pacifist in the Gandhi sense, as evidence his editorial endorsement of "every plank" in the Woman's Peace Party platform, which he printed on the first page of UNITY, and which called for an "international police force."

The important thing for UNITY today is that its liberal policy shall remain constant, and that in the light of this policy it shall deal freely and competently with the issues that confront the world today. Less than this, no liberal should want; more than this, no liberal should expect.

Humanism and the Present Religious Horizon

A. STIERNOTTE

PART I

Humanist religion has not now the influence that it had, say, eight or ten years ago, when a theological battle of historic importance seemed to be approaching. Such books as *Humanism—A New Battle Line* indicated quite clearly the profound difference in the intellectual formulations of the "modernists" and the "humanists." Though it would not be easy to give a precise account of the fortunes of humanist religion in the last decade, there are a few signs in the trend of present theological and philosophical thought which give any patient observer the distinct impression that a naturalistic religion is not receiving the favorable hearing that it deserves. For instance, almost every issue of *Radical Religion* contains strictures on what is repeatedly called "the liberal and humanistic culture of our age." Criticism of rationalism and humanism is most severe when issuing from the proponents of the new supernaturalism—a movement which is at present devastating the American theological scene—though few humanists seem to be aware of it. If in the chaos of European politics new and unforeseen alignments create bewilderment, if the choice between social alternatives is so nicely poised as to involve undesirable consequences no matter what the decision may be, if the attempt to further human values is more difficult and far-reaching than at first assumed—ah, say the supernaturalists, these are evidences that the facile humanism of our times is unable to come to grips with human problems; only a religion which reveals the conflict between the forces of nature and spirit can do justice to these paradoxes and contradictions. In short, almost every disturbing situation is seized upon by these champions of the new orthodoxy as a justification for their "dialectical" theology, a very profound sounding name indeed!

There would seem to be a necessity for examining

anew the significance of humanist religion, and it is therefore desirable to appreciate its origin, development, and present position in the light of the forces with which it is in constant interaction. So a very cursory survey of American theological thought may shed some light on the possibilities of a naturalistic religion.

I. From Modernism to Humanism

It is common knowledge that the beginning of the present century marked an advance of liberal religion which led to a sharp differentiation between the two tendencies known as modernism and fundamentalism—though the conflict came to a head in the late twenties. The liberal religious movement, considered in its broadest aspects, had two developments, one a theological, the other a social, and these two were at times closely interrelated, and sometimes not. It seems best therefore to consider them separately.

For the inception of a liberal religious outlook, priority must be given the Universalists and Unitarians who have been far more adaptable than other denominations to the inevitable reconstructions which the discoveries of science entailed. It is true, however, that in the early decades of this century other denominations adopted a liberal spirit, not through the direct influence of Unitarians but simply because social life had become so transformed by the multifarious applications of science that religion was perforce induced to inquire into the theoretical aspects of science, and attempt to reform its theology accordingly. The theory of evolution, for instance, was accepted in some form, progressive creation replacing creation by fiat. Science in the popular mind became a god to whom all problems and perplexities could be delivered with the distinct assurance that its priests, mysterious gentlemen whom the comic sections of our newspapers depicted with long beards and called "scientists," would by some quasi-magical concoctions in their research laboratories, produce a solution which would revolutionize our mode of life! Science was indeed "a very present help in trouble"! This is written in no disparagement of the benefits which a scientific civilization has brought and may yet bring, but rather to emphasize the popular impression that science can surmount all difficulties and bring in an age of plenty. It is only in recent years that scientists have been troubled by the social results of their work, and have come to the disquieting conclusion that science, just as every other human activity, is held in the grip of titanic forces which must be controlled if human welfare is to be achieved. The success of the quarterly *Science and Society,* such books as D. J. Bernal's *The Social Function of Science,* and the recent organization of societies of scientific workers in both Great Britain and the United States show a distinct trend toward social responsibility on the part of scientists, just as the best religious minds have for quite a time felt that religion had a social responsibility.

On the theoretical side the pronouncements of physicists such as Jeans, Eddington, and Millikan were heralded as marking the return of science to religion. But there is an amusing side to this return of the scientific prodigal son which is this: in the nineteenth century that aspect of physics which most provoked theologians was the "fortuitous concourse of atoms" with accent on the fortuitous. In the twentieth century, however, that aspect of physics which has received a blessing from theologians is precisely that same "fortuitous concourse of atoms," for according to the principle of indeterminacy, the motions of atoms and electrons are thought to be fortuitous, and so released from the bondage of mechanistic materialism. There are eminent mathematicians, however, such as H. Levy of the Imperial College of Science in London, and D. J. Struik of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who hold that the principle of indeterminacy does not invalidate the laws of causation in the intra-atomic world. It would seem to be the case that the present instruments of science are unable to determine both the position and the speed of an electron at the same instant. And so professors of astro-physics sought to hew out a mathematical deity from a non-Euclidian space-time continuum of indeterminate point-events! It is only necessary to point out in passing that the best religious spirits of all ages found potentialities of divinity much nearer home—in the poor and the oppressed, in the despised and the rejected of men.

The difficulty of the typical modernist outlook lies in the fact that it is based on a Platonic view of the universe. On one side is the material world, for whose investigation due credit is given to science; but over and above this material world is a spiritual world out of the reach of scientific inquiry since the latter is taken to deal only with facts and not values. There is thus a philosophical dualism which might be called neo-platonism, the world of science and its applications overshadowed by the world of pure spirit inhabited by the pure essence of things, invisible spiritual forces which could somehow heave and tug at the material world and make it more humane. This was the typical philosophy of modernism which received a terrific jolt, however, with the post-war disillusionment, for the world of social relations in which we live, move, and have our being, was perceived to possess some grim aspects and intractabilities quite beyond the reach of ethical forces to overcome in the spirit of sweet reasonableness so often symbolized as "the spirit of Jesus." That is to say, the idealism of Jesus and of the other spiritual giants whose lives were incarnations of a deathless quality is so high above the capacities of the rest of mankind that it passes out of the realm of practical ethics and politics into the realm of art and beauty. To wish "to be like Jesus" from this point of view would seem to be the mark of a shallow spirituality rather than a profound one, though it was thought only a few years ago that a little more charity and just a little more philanthropy would bring about the Kingdom of God.

The practical difficulty was thus based upon an inadequate appraisal of the ideals of religion and the forces which bring them to closer realization, and most philosophical and social realists would say that the fault was due to the bifurcations of idealist philosophy which arbitrarily divided man into body and mind, and the universe into matter and spirit. Idealist philosophy however, lost a good deal of its hold when a more thoroughgoing trend appeared in the Unitarian Church, whose emergence was described by Walter Marshall Horton in *Theism and the Modern Mood* (Harper & Bros.), as follows:

> The Unitarian Church serves as a pretty good barometer for the detection of approaching theological storms; and there is good historical precedent for predicting that when not merely a few eccentric individuals but a large, self-conscious group in that denomination boldly adopts the humanistic label, and frankly rejects the belief in God and immortality, the humanist hurricane is going to strike all Christendom before long.

The theological storm here referred to is the transi-

tion from theism to humanism, though it is perhaps incorrect to speak of a storm as both theists and humanists are in happy fellowship in the Unitarian Church. The Unitarian theist probably looks with sympathy at the views of his humanist brother, while the non-Unitarian theist looks upon humanism not as a valid expression of religion among others but rather as a peril which challenges the foundations of the whole religious edifice. For the source of this humanism, one should consult the work of Melville Louis Welke, on "The Provenance of Humanism within the Unitarian Movement" available at the Library of the Meadville Theological School. Some of the significant trends in the Unitarian tradition which point the way to humanism may, however, be mentioned briefly. For instance, Unitarians hardly ever spoke of their belief in God, it was their thought of God. Again, they placed a tremendous value upon human personality, and stressed the divinity of man over against the sinfulness of man long expatiated upon by the orthodox churches. Also, ready response to scientific method and results inevitably led to a shelving of the philosophical dualism referred to previously for the evolutionary naturalism of modern science. These three trends of thought had probably very much to do with the intellectual and theoretical formulation of the humanist movement.

The point of departure for the movement arose in a sermon preached from the pulpit of the First Unitarian Church of Des Moines, in 1917, in which Curtis W. Reese, later Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, described a "revolution in religion, from theocracy to humanism, from autocracy to democracy." Mr. Reese further stated that "the theocratic view of the world order is autocratic and the humanistic view is democratic." The issue to which theists, however, reacted was not the democratic emphasis of humanism but its comparative indifference to their philosophical views. As a result of this disagreement a period of controversy intervened to deflect the humanist movement from its original emphasis on democracy to engage in strenuous battle to defend the position of evolutionary naturalism against an outmoded theology. John H. Dietrich must be given credit for giving the movement a rationalist tendency, which, while extremely valuable in breaking new ground, was after all only a foundation for positive action along the lines of humanizing democracy. One may venture the opinion that the humanist movement will regain vigor and influence only as it penetrates to the roots of the democratic problem in a growing totalitarian world. Edwin H. Wilson, secretary of the Humanist Press Association, in a recent article in *The Christian Register* on "The Humanist Controversy Is History," uttered words of wisdom when he stated:

> Today, when obvious need is for men of good will of all theological persuasions to lay aside their doctrinal differences and unite in the defense of democracy, the last thing that should be encouraged is speculative theological differences. Agreement needs to be sought affirmatively on concrete programs of action. The recognition of this is to lay aside theological labels and to return to the point of departure for the entire humanist controversy, namely the effort to humanize democracy.

As to the extent of the humanist movement, soon after the pioneering work of Mr. Reese and Mr. Dietrich other Unitarian ministers adopted the same position. A section of the Society of Friends and of Reform Judaism is very close to humanism, not to mention the interest displayed by not a few Universalist ministers. It cannot be denied that a small but very influential group in American religious life is possessed of this spirit, and it is not too much to say that its full implications have not yet been completely uncovered.

Now what is this humanism? Of course there have been several types of humanism in history. First, Greek humanism with its "note of sanity" so well brought out by Livingstone in *The Greek Genius,* where men, or at least those who were freed from the necessities of slave labor, first lived as men in a natural environment and not as victims of a supernatural drama fraught with grave possibilities. Renaissance humanism was marked by the rediscovery of the Greek and Roman classics. The Enlightenment was distinguished by its scientific humanism in which the spirit of impartial inquiry and the free play of human reason became dominant. As to religious humanism it had its birth in Europe in Ludwig Feuerbach who derived so much from Hegel, and who was in turn the transition in the philosophical development from Hegel to Marx. A type of humanism which probably belongs to the future is the Marxist humanism of Edmund Wilson, though one must admit that the word Marxian has an unsavory connotation in these days. As far as contemporary religious humanism is concerned, it is represented by the Humanist Press Association of Chicago which is the meeting ground of the theological left in Unitarianism and other denominations with the humanistic thinkers and writers in the universities. Its publications are the best source of information on the subject.

The basic conception in Unitarian humanism is M. C. Otto's excellent definition "loyalty to the human venture," which is set in the evolutionary philosophy that describes this venture as a natural development in "the planet having come to consciousness." As Raymond B. Bragg so well expressed it:

> Out of the earth we came, out of it our meanings, our possibilities are derived; without reference to this planet our lives amount to nothing significant. A sense of at-homeness with other men, all children of the Earth, is far more satisfying to me, whatever the tragedies and frustration, than the assumed completion in a compensatory world beyond. Heaven no matter how elaborately constructed remains a lifeless substitute for a world that we can know and understand. Scriptures accepted as a chart for a heaven-bound humanity pale in the light of a literature arising out of human need and aspiration. This world in its fulness, in its warmth, its triumphs—yes, even in its regrets, its sorrows—is the only world we know. Men will not forever regard it as a vestibule to a larger life. Already there are those who have forsaken the older world of the traditional religions to accept the realities of a sturdy and growing humanism.

Within this central set-up the humanist venture is regarded from varying points of view. Some humanists, for instance, show the strong influence in their thinking of nineteenth-century free thought and positivism, others of Dewey pragmatism and instrumentalism. All stress the importance of the social sciences with differing degrees of emphasis, some feeling that the strains of our complex civilization are merely due to a few maladjustments here and there, while others desire more far-reaching reform and are in fact very close to the Christian socialist school of thought. Others still, such as Raymond B. Bragg and John Haynes Holmes, are chiefly characterized by the generous humanism of mind and heart, which constantly reminds one of the writings of Irwin Edman. At this point one must pass on to the other tendency in the liberal religious movement, that of social reform.

[*To Be Continued*]

Mussolini Muscles In

DEVERE ALLEN and E. DIXWELL CHASE

[NOTE: Just back in the United States after a year in Europe, and following a trip of 1,500 miles by car in Italy, the authors, respectively editor and managing editor of the *Nofrontier News Service,* reflect in this article their findings about the attitude of Italians toward the war. In the course of their travels through the more important cities and the countryside, they talked with Italians of all viewpoints, officials of foreign governments, newspaper writers glad to unburden themselves of facts bottled up by censorship, and foreign residents of many years' standing.—*Editor.*]

In declaring war upon France and Great Britain, Mussolini has contradicted the almost unanimous desire of the Italian people to remain at peace. What Rome correspondents have not been allowed to send out, but what has been the most common everyday experience for hundreds of travellers through the country since the start of the European conflict, is the criticism, freely volunteered by Italian men and women, of the governmental policy that headed them for war, and of the Duce himself.

A taxi driver, a waiter, a porter, or a chance acquaintance on the street usually required no urging. Spontaneously they voiced the desperate fear and anxiety preying on their minds. "We no longer have anything to say about the decisions they make in Rome," said one business man in a northern city; "we don't know what is going to happen, but none of us wants this war."

So strong was the desire for peace that it found expression even in the official functionaries, who clung to their Leader while vainly hoping he would not blast their faith. One simon-pure Fascist in Rome, for example, a part of whose duty it is to impress foreign visitors with the achievements of the regime, asserted: "Mussolini has a brain. He won't plunge this country and his people into a disastrous war." Among less enthusiastic supporters, however, there was often a different estimate of the Duce's mental capacities. One Florentine shopkeeper who stopped to chat on the sidewalk glanced hastily over his shoulder, then ventured the opinion that "the man up north" was certainly crazy, "and between you and me"—here his fingers described circles about his ear—"I think our man is a bit that way too."

Coupled with this ardent desire to remain out of the war is an almost universal dislike of the Germans. The Italians have not forgotten against whom they fought the last war. True, they still hold rancor against the British for broken promises at Versailles, and an animosity against the French, though notably less marked; and resentment still burns against the sanctions imposed during the Ethiopian raid by the present Allies, for it was felt then, and is now, that the Italian people were not especially to blame, yet were indiscriminately made victims under the hardships of the sanctionist program.

Official propaganda, by which Italians are supposedly made to feel hemmed in, chiefly through British control of Mediterranean outlets, finds scant expression among the masses. With the French people, the tie of Latin blood is strong; operative also is the fact that Italian emigration into France has been heavy for a great many years, and contacts normally have been intimate and constant. The phrase commonly heard to express what the man in the street would most like to see happen, is this: "We wish they would both just run down and stop." As one man put it: "We don't want the Nazis to win, because if they do it will be this"—and he struck a clenched fist into the palm of his left hand—"but we don't want to see the Allies win, either, because that would leave the same old impossible Europe."

Italian cities swarm with political spies. They bob up in such naiveté as to be almost amusing. But it is no fun for the Italians: one erstwhile liberal, arrested and put under pressure, turned about and was subsequently responsible for the incarceration of dozens of his former associates. The punishment for political offenses is drastic. Open rebellion, or extensive undercover agitation, has been nearly eliminated. Yet the people have the temerity to make such remarks as, "If he takes us to war we will go because we have no choice; and if he just takes us to Africa it won't be so bad. But if he forces us to march against the French, we will fight as badly as we know how."

Not soon will the present writers forget the black gloom on Italian faces one morning in Milan, when rumor had it that entry into the conflict was imminent; and then the sudden relaxation, the smiles and cheerful whistles when later in the day another rumor went around town to the effect that Italy would not go in, after all. Nor will they forget the pre-fabricated crowd shepherded into the Piazza Venezia at Rome by black-shirted leaders of Fascist organizations to hear Mussolini speak from his famous balcony. Maybe there *were* 200,000 people in that square when Il Duce announced his declaration of war, as news reports asserted; it is capable of holding that many, and the job of rounding up an impressive audience might be stepped up to suit so urgent a situation. But on a great, long-heralded national holiday, the anniversary of the founding of Rome, the square was virtually empty, and thousands of people, strolling through the streets, seemed singularly interested in going somewhere, anywhere, else. Salutes were few, and usually half-hearted. Cheers, carefully led by appointed masters of ceremonies, were feeble and uninspiring. So small was the crowd, even after Il Duce had dramatically delayed his appearance for an hour while his supporters drummed up trade, that it numbered at most 5,000, though the expected pronouncement was previously heralded as momentous. A motion-picture camera on a high pedestal had to be wheeled around at the last moment to the opposite side of the square and focussed down on the people immediately under the balcony and in the Corso, the closest street; this photograph appeared in all the Italian papers, and all over the world, with edges trimmed off so that a "sea of faces" were depicted eagerly hanging on every word from the Leader.

It was little different with one of the "great, anti-

British demonstrations" at Genoa, which was really a parade of twenty or so sheepish-looking schoolboys, marching through the streets with flags, under the supervision of a blackshirt, self-consciously emitting weak cries in unison from time to time when the blackshirt gave a signal. One Italian along the line of march, a merchant, watched them out of sight, then contemptuously remarked, "They just don't want to go to school any more, that's all that is the matter with them." On the other hand, Mussolini has insured a certain youthful following by establishing a school of physical training to which 400 highly selected young athletes are admitted annually for a four years' course; bands of these sturdy boys, destined to become party leaders, march around in running suits, with rifles on their shoulders, snappily singing songs pledging themselves to give their blood for the empire.

Significant in its portent, and indicative of a defiant mood of which an intelligent Leader ought to be painfully aware, were the much-publicized posters, pasted up on public buildings, even hotels, inveighing against Britain and linking Italian welfare with Nazi progress. What reporting from Italy has not been able to make clear is that almost universally these posters were ripped to pieces nearly as soon as put up. The technique was to back up against the offending poster, stand and chat a while until the street was clear or the traffic policeman was looking the other way or the red-bordered Napoleonic uniform of the military police was not to be seen, then with hands behind backs, tear the paper through the whole center of the sheet.

In at least one instance, this feeling found organized expression. When the writers left Italy to go into Switzerland, their papers were scrutinized with extreme care, and they were asked by frontier guards if they had not been in Taormina. "No, we haven't been in Sicily at all." "Are you sure? I'm positive I have seen you there." "No; we haven't been that far south at all." This question continued a perplexing one, until, a few days later, the fact came out (perhaps not reported in the Western Hemisphere) that a revolt had broken out in Sicily and as a result 400 anti-Fascists had been jailed.

Although hardly anything about the reluctance of the Italian people to go into the war has been printed in the Allied press during recent weeks and months, the French and British peoples have been grossly misled. It has been hammered into them that Italy would in due time join the Allies, a possibility which only a short stay in the Italian peninsula showed anyone to be fantastic. British governmental representatives at Rome had been trying feverishly, but apparently with the most disheartening failure, to make their government, and that of the French, see that quite the contrary was the truth. By lending credence to the gossip about Ciano having become so unpopular that he was due for exile, or the story that "Italy is on the fence, with one leg that of Mussolini and the other that of Ciano," the Allies manifested again their characteristic and well-nigh fatal capacity for self-deception.

That Mussolini was not unaware of the popular feeling was shown, before he took the final plunge, by the attempts he and his party leaders instigated to check the sale of foreign newspapers and the anti-Nazi Vatican organ, the *Osservatore Romano*. When, because it contained the only objective news available, its circulation shot from 12,000 up to 125,000, bands of young blackshirts were sent around to buy up all copies on the newsstands, to threaten buyers, and in some cases to beat up insistent purchasers. Though all foreign papers could be had up until three weeks before the declaration of war, at that stage certain French papers especially hostile to the Duce were banned and their entry into the country forbidden. Thus when one of the editors of the *Nofrontier News Service* returned to Genoa to embark, papers were confiscated which had actually been bought a short time before in Rome!

In the fight that he has undertaken, Mussolini has behind him a gloomy, sullen, even embittered, people; a people upon whom the dark weight of impending tragedy lay so heavily that storekeepers no longer cared as they watched their businesses dry up, so heavily indeed that a great writer and one brilliant scientist at any rate could no longer bring themselves to do any work, and definitely abandoned all of their constructive efforts. As foreigners long resident in Italy took leave of their Italian friends to return to America, not a tear was shed by the Italians. "We are glad for you because you are going," they could only say; "Don't come back. If we could, we would all go with you. You are more fortunate than we. Be thankful for it."

A Pilgrimage of Peace

HENRY CARTER*

George Lansbury's last book is open before me—*My Quest for Peace*. On the title page, in his familiar writing, are the words:

> A tiny token of remembrance of happy, worrying, hectic and peaceful days, working together at home and abroad, seeking the Spirit of Love and Peace.

The book is the story of the journeys in Europe which G. Lansbury undertook in the last five years of his crowded life already devoted to the service of the plain folk he loved so well. They were journeys whose sole object was to reason and plead with the statesmen who ruled European countries to turn from the fatal armaments race and unitedly build peace for the sake of the common people of all lands.

We had formed in 1936 the free-lance Christian group which came to be known as "Embassies of Reconciliation." It grew out of talks at the International Fellowship of Reconciliation Conference which met in Cambridge that year. Charles Raven was its chairman, and Percy Bartlett its tireless secretary. George Lansbury became, as we loved to call him, "Ambassador-in-Chief." He had laid down the Labor Party leadership on the sanctions and armaments issue; had crossed to the United States and seen President Roosevelt and Mr. Cordell Hull; and had come back to England eager to advance the claim for a genuine World Conference to grapple with the causes of the growing tensions between European Governments as the one way to prevent war.

*General Secretary of the Social Welfare Department of the Methodist Church in London, England.

We drew together. That is the only way in which I can describe what happened. The F.O.R. group asked him whether, breaking through convention, he would visit the capitals of Europe; see the rulers face to face, and try to win their assent to the World Conference project. He reflected, and accepted. "I do not go as a leader or even as a politician," he wrote; "but as one ordinary man talking to other ordinary men, striving to bring the minds of statesmen down to earth, asking them to realize whither they are travelling, and before it is too late to come together and at least try to find a way out."

So in 1936 he saw Léon Blum and Van Zeeland, then Prime Ministers of France and Belgium, respectively; and, later, went to Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, and saw their Premiers and Foreign Secretaries. From each he got the promise of help, and on return urged on members of the British Government the need to seize these offers of coöperation by democrats in peace-building.

There came to him, in the spring of 1937, the conviction that he must pass beyond discussion with fellow-democrats and meet the dictators face to face. Vividly I recall a talk in a Westminster restaurant. "I prayed this morning," he said, " 'Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us,' and I felt sure that I ought to go to Berlin and Rome and see Hitler and Mussolini." He went, and brought back Hitler's statement of willingness to join "in a united effort to establish economic coöperation and mutual understanding between the nations of the world." It was a real opportunity. Hitler had not then turned decisively to a war policy to redress German grievances. Had the opportunity been seized, the present war might have been averted, and the foundations of durable peace laid.

But it was lost. European tension increased. Undaunted, George Lansbury went in December, 1937, to Prague, Warsaw, and Vienna. Percy Bartlett and I accompanied him. His prestige assured long interviews with the Presidents and other statesmen of all three countries. In August, 1938, on the same mission the F.O.R. group went to the Balkans, where the direct effort was repeated. George Lansbury had long discussions with the Premier of Bulgaria, King Carol of Roumania, Prince Paul and the Regent of Jugoslavia, and Admiral Horthy in Hungary. The purport of these interviews, and the possibilities of peace which George Lansbury knew to exist, were communicated to responsible British statesmen in the hope that British policy might yet sustain the Van Zeeland effort to found peace on international economic collaboration.

One final effort was made. In August last, actually a few weeks before the outbreak of war, we travelled hurriedly to Brussels, and together saw M. Pierlot, the Prime Minister. The next day George Lansbury had a long private audience with the King of the Belgians; one can say with truth that all that the King of a small neutral State could do to avert war King Leopold attempted.

Was there ever another such Pilgrim of Peace? Long beyond the three score years and ten of man's earthly journeying he toiled, for love of Christ and humanity, to hold back the evil menace of war's destructive furies, to turn the mind of rulers and peoples towards the peace that could spring from active consideration of each other's needs, and to keep before a darkening world the vision of a Fatherhood of love and a brotherhood of mutual service.

Futility

CARL PETERSON

At the age of twelve Ray was a member of the Young Radicals. He was put to work distributing pamphlets and cards at May Day parades and protest meetings. These pamphlets would declare that the workers are being ground into the dirt and only a proletarian revolution would save them.

At the age of fifteen Ray had joined the Young Radicals League and had led a few debates at meetings. He was becoming known for his fiery talking and fierce gestures. He would read avidly the party booklets and the *Daily Laborer*. He learned how to take the true class position on all questions. At one time he nearly came to blows with a fellow who maintained that there was no class angle to music. Ray said there could be bourgeois music and proletariat music. Whoever favored the former was an enemy of the future proletariat state in Soviet America.

At the age of eighteen Ray had joined the party of true human liberation and freedom from oppression. He spent a great deal of time bothering the officers at labor disputes and worked best when there was a picket line. He would travel all over town to find a picket line where he could march. Then he would pass out revolutionary leaflets to the strikers and instruct them in ways of taunting the bosses when they showed up in the morning.

In local affairs Ray became quite a hero because of the many nights that he had to spend in jail for baiting the police. In discussions at party caucuses he was becoming a terror. He increasingly took the position that the party policies in the fatherland were not what they should be. His superiors would quote certain passages to him from the works of the founder and saint of the party, but Ray would insist that his own point of view had its merits. His leaders cautioned him to remember that there was a limit to the freedom of thought party members were allowed. Ray felt that he must deviate from this position. He knew his right to think as he pleased.

When he failed to endorse the new economic measures taking place in the Fatherland and refused to contribute towards sending a cable to the Fatherland's leader, praising him, the party felt that Ray deserved to be called before the censors and rebuked.

"Not me," said Ray, "I deviate. I want to join a party where I can think for myself and as I wish."

It was then that Ray felt the boot of expulsion for the first time. He knew that the agricultural policy of the Fatherland was wrong.

At twenty Ray joined with the forces of the International Laborers Party. They were smaller than the group he had grown up with, but they possessed a fiery

determination to put over the revolution in no time. A large part of the energy they had was used to denounce the larger of the radical parties. It was termed reactionary and bureaucratic. Ray made many speeches telling of his life in its inner circles and the corruption that rules there.

Appointed editor of the weekly four-page paper published by the International Laborers Party, Ray wrote long and voluminously on all matters of political controversy. He passed as a learned authority and was asked to speak before radical clubs in the larger universities. Yet the progress towards the revolution was slow. The party was at fault and especially the national secretary. He appeared to be a hidebound bookscholar who had never learned the true use of scientific radicalism. Ray tried to have him removed. He would take over his job.

The party and its eight hundred members opposed this bright idea of Ray's. They soon realized that their editor was "too far in advance," "too much to the left" for them.

It would compromise his honor to remain editor, Ray declared, and resigned. No longer would he tolerate a reactionary bourgeois party masquerading as a revolutionary workers' party. He would found a party of his own. He had a few loyal friends who met to discuss matters in the Sixteenth Street Cafeteria. With them he would found a new and true radical party of his own. He would have his own paper.

Ray succeeded quite well in this. He developed a national New Reformed Left League which acquired a national membership of two hundred and fifty. At one time they had a candidate running for state committeeman in New Jersey. He received eighty-three votes. Ray termed this a victory for the coming "inheritors of the earth—the toilers of hand and brain."

Later one of the professors who acted as secretary of the party got in trouble with Ray over the interpretation that the party should give to the invasion of Ruthania by the Socialist Fatherland. They disagreed and Ray left his party.

He would start a new party. One in which he would be the sole member. There could be no disputes then.

"At last," said Ray, "I shall be the first and only one-man political party of this country. I am unique. I know all and people will need only to hear my words and there will be peace, plenty, and happiness for the now downtrodden masses."

Not long after this Ray disagreed with himself over the question of the worth of the masses to receive his enormous and invaluable wisdom. He felt called upon to take up revolutionary arms. He knew it would end his own life but he said that reactionary and Tory influences must be destroyed at all costs.

I have not heard from him lately.

Trumpets on New Horizons

No Empire's Raucous Voice

Play no martial music. Strike the keyboard dumb.
Let silence thunder out war's opprobrium.
Hear! The sobs of mothers cheated of their sons,
The shrieks of farm-folk mown by havoc-coughing guns,
The screams of women tortured in body, memory, soul,
The prayers of lonely children torn from refuge-hole,
Drown out the harmonies that empires give the lie.
In discords war creates let martial music die.

No imperial music. Let the keyboard freeze.
Seal your hearing's holy gift to such as these
Lest the sacrament of music be profaned,
Its white expanse of perfect peace be crimson-stained.
Till every warlord's face of Grinning Death is bared
This music has such undertones the earth is scared.
Demoniac Possession who can wholly doubt
Who hears all war-borne music's black, stampeding route?

But let the strains of love, the music peace composed,
Remind not always were the hearts of empires closed
To gentle chords of kindness, mercy's melting tones,
The surge of awe for more than steel and hate and bones,
Remind of thousands now in concentration camps,
Of hidden hearts at large through whom rebellion tramps.

RALPH CHEYNEY.

Width of a Line

A church may boast a mammoth door;
A spire, flamboyant, an acre of floor
Never smudged with the grime of sin—
Yet be so narrow, God cannot get in.

ETHEL FAIRFIELD WHITE.

Ninth Episode from the Parade of the Dead Soldiers

Their perpetual grin grew less grim
Seemed almost merry. . .
As they drifted by a giant steel mill
Roaring . . .
Roaring in a whirring, stirring voice
An undying ditty:

"I am the mill . . . the deified mill . . .
That makes the shell . . . the butcher shell . . .
That makes the hell . . . the butcher hell . . .
For the soldier . . . soldier . . . soldier . . . !"

Nearby they saw where a fat man sat
In Sybarian luxury . . .
Wearing tall silk hat,
Hedonistic smirk,
And
Protruding
Food—
Pregnant
Stomach.

The librating tongue of literate mill
Droned-droned jeeringly:

"There sits the man . . . man . . . man . . .
That owns the mill . . . the deified mill . . .
That makes the shell . . . the butcher shell . . .
That makes the hell . . . the butcher hell . . .
For the soldier . . . soldier . . . soldier . . .
While the soldier got hell . . . hell . . . hell . . .
He got the heavenly dollar . . . dollar . . . dollar . . . !"

ROBERT ATWOOD.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XIX

A United Press dispatch from Delhi, India, reports the following:

Mohandas K. Gandhi, Indian Nationalist leader, appealed to all Britons tonight to lay down their arms and settle their difference with Germany by "non-violent methods."

Gandhi made the appeal in a message to the Marquess of Linlithgow, Viceroy of India, offering his services to the British government to "advance the object" of his appeal. The message was 2,000 words in length and ended "in God's name," it was said.

The Indian leader urged Britain not to enter "undignified competition with the Nazis in destructive power," and proposed non-violent methods of adjusting differences between nations.

The New York Labor Temple, A. J. Muste, minister, has announced that its people "will vigorously oppose the proposal that the United States should reply to the recent developments in Europe with a further vast increase in our armament." Armament leads to more armament, "with every million dollars' worth of war equipment which any nation produces all nations are by so much less secure." The United States should give a distinctive lead, the statement asserts, which would be eagerly welcomed by "millions now entangled in a war which nobody wants and from which nobody expects any good," by renouncing war, offering to use the billions thus saved in the economic rehabilitation of Europe and Asia and in setting up a federal world government which would be patterned largely on the lines of the American union.

New York newspapers publish the following item of local news:

Faced by the possibility of early passage of a military conscription law, seven pacifists met yesterday in the first session of the Metropolitan Board for Conscientious Objectors, set up to offer private consultation and advice to all who have moral scruples against military service.

General chairman of the board is Dr. Evan W. Thomas, professor of medicine at New York University and brother of Norman Thomas, Socialist nominee for President. Dr. Thomas went to prison for nine months during the World War because of conscientious objections to war. In answer to a question, he said that he was prepared to go to jail again if conscripted.

"We will meet each Monday from 5 to 7 p. m.," the pacifists' chairman said. "All who come to us seeking advice we will be glad to help. We will not, however, conduct any campaign to persuade people to become pacifists. Many whose consciences will not permit them to take up arms may decide that they may serve in non-combatant duty."

Other board members at the organization meeting were the Reverend Laurence T. Hosie, associate director of the Presbyterian Labor Temple; DeWitt Wyckoff, lawyer; Dr. Jessie Wallace Hughan, secretary of the War Resisters League; Herman Adlerstein, attorney; J. Nelson Tuck, editor of *The Conscientious Objector;* and Abraham Kaufman, secretary of the United Pacifist Committee.

Chief organizations represented are the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the War Resisters League, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

"America seems to be caught in a wave of militarism which cannot now be halted," Dr. Thomas said. "There may come a time, however, when our voice will be listened to. All we can do is to stick to our principles through the hard going. Speaking for myself, I think war and totalitarianism are practically the same thing."

The Reverend Mr. Hosie put his pacifism on religious grounds, saying: "The religious pacifist would hold you cannot preach the brotherhood of man and defend it by the war method. The two are exactly opposite. I don't know any group who knows the menace of Hitlerism more than pacifists, but we feel that war is Hitlerism."

The New York *Times* publishes the following announcement:

More than 200 prominent Protestant churchmen called upon all Christians to speak and work for peace. The statement declared "that the best interests of the people of America and the cause of the Prince of Peace, can best be served by steadfastly refusing to become involved in this war."

Giving emphasis to its statement, the group recalled the pronouncements made by leading religious groups at the close of the last war, which were outspoken in their abhorrence of military force.

The call was sent out by the Reverend Dr. William Lloyd Imes, pastor of St. James Presbyterian Church, New York; the Rev. Dr. W. Russell Bowie, professor at Union Theological Seminary; the Rev. Dr. John Howland Lathrop, pastor of the Church of Our Saviour, Brooklyn; the Rev. Dr. Allan Knight Chalmers, pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York; the Right Rev. W. Appleton Lawrence, bishop of Western Massachusetts; the Rev. C. Lawson Willard, rector of St. James Church, Elmhurst, Queens, and the Rev. Bradford Young, rector of Christ Church, Manchester, N. H.

Among the leading ministers from all over the United States who signed the statement were: the Rev. Dr. Charles F. Boss, Jr., executive secretary, Commission of World Peace of the Methodist Church, Chicago; the Rev. Elbert N. Conover, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York; the Rev. Dorr Diefendorf, former editor *The Christian Advocate;* the Rev. H. E. J. Gratz, editor of *The Epworth Herald,* Chicago; the Rev. Dr. C. Franklin Koch, executive secretary, Social Missions of United Lutheran Church, New York; the Rev. Dr. Halford E. Luccock, professor at Yale Divinity School; the Rev. Edwin M. Poteat, pastor, Euclid Avenue Baptist Church, Cleveland; the Rev. Dr. Henry L. Robison, director religious work in State institutions, Richmond, Va.; the Rev. Dr. W. A. Smart, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.; the Rev. Dr. Joseph M. Dawson, Waco, Texas; Mrs. Henry Hill Pierce, National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York; the Rev. Lynn T. White, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif.; the Rev. Dr. Edward W. Blakeman, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; the Rev. James Robertson, Grand Forks, N. D.

President Daniel L. Marsh, of Boston University, interprets the attitude of college students towards war today in an interview in the Boston *Herald,* in which he says:

Let us not be too hard on the young people who are not being swept off their feet by war psychosis. It might even be that they are thinking more clearly than are some of their elders. They honor and revere the memory of men who have died for their country; but they believe that a man who makes his country worth dying for is as worthy of honor as one who dies for it. They believe that war is the greatest collective social sin of the age. They are persuaded that war is not only the summation of all villainy, but that it is utterly futile. These college students have studied history, and as students of history, they know that war has never settled any question.

The whole nation held the same convictions while these

college students were passing through childhood and adolescence. The nation in calm mood reviewed how it got into the first world war, and then through its representatives in Congress wrote into law its calm determination never again to become involved in a European war. It was of that conviction that our present neutrality laws were born. Now, these college students are asking, was the nation right when, in freedom from war hysteria, it so recorded its high purpose? These college students who are opposed to aiding the Allies are afraid that extending aid will lead to war. They are trying to keep themselves calm in the midst of calamity, knowing that straight and accurate thinking is difficult in a period of national excitement.

College students have not yet been persuaded that Hitler has designs of conquest upon the United States,—and it will take a great deal more than war phychosis created by a President's ambitions for a third term to convince them of any real danger from this source. They are fully persuaded that America has no business to fight Europe's wars,—and the war hysteria has not yet disturbed their serenity any more than the Civil War disrupted the serenity of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

The voice of pacifism has been heard unmistakably in Cincinnati, as witness the following report of a *Christian Century* correspondent:

There has recently been a great deal of debate in Cincinnati concerning America's relationship to the war. Archbishop McNicholas, addressing the commencement exercises for Catholic schools said: "This country's participation in the last great war did not settle Europe's difficulties and neither will participation in the present one. There are no moral grounds for our entering a conflict on Europe's battlefields." Dr. G. Barrett Rich III declared in his Memorial Day message: "The chief task of the church of Christ during these troublous times is to use all its influence to keep America out of war. No nation gains anything from war except poverty, sorrow, and death. To keep out of war is the only way to save humanity."

Muriel Lester, addressing a large group at the Y. W., said that "this war is the inevitable and automatic retribution that always follows sin. If we want a peace based on real justice we have got to begin to discipline ourselves personally to discover what justice is. We have to learn how other people feel. We take our freedom for granted and attach no duties to it. Justice will never come through murdering a few more million people. We need a new sort of Christian."

A group of citizens, including such clergymen as L. W. Almy, Edwin C. Brown, Abraham Cronbach, Joseph Fletcher, Harold Geistweit, Harry G. Hill, Bruce Maguire, Ernest Merlanti, Alfred Moore, Jackson Smith and E. R. Stafford, issued a manifesto opposing one of the President's warlike utterances. Addressing the graduating class of the University of Cincinnati, Fred Olert of the First Presbyterian Church of Detroit said: "No nation can be godless and remain free. I hate war and I believe that God hates war. It accomplishes nothing, nobody wins, everybody loses immeasurably. I believe we ought to stay out. It is our solemn duty to assist those forces at work seeking to bind men's hearts together in a common brotherhood." Kirby Page, addressing the F.O.R. asserted that "to take up arms against Hitler would only be sowing more evil seed which must some day be reaped. If the Allies win they will so break Germany that Versailles will seem like a Sunday school picnic. There is not an atom of evidence that when the war is ended the victors will be generous to the vanquished."

The California correspondent of the *Christian Century* reports a non-resistant sermon preached by Dr. Albert Edward Day of the First Methodist Church, Pasadena:

The preacher's business in this world is to speak the mind of Christ, so far as he can discover it, no matter what politicians or business men or military experts or the mob may say. . . It may be that every tear on the cheek of a German mother watching her undernourished child sink into a premature grave, and every fear of the German people during those tragic years after Versailles, must now be paid for by the tears and fears of our Allies and ourselves. Let us escape frothy sentimentalism and bacchanalian nonsense by keeping the whole, sobering historical picture before us.

If the worst comes . . . some of us will resist by non-violence. That seems to me the only way to defeat evil and redeem the evil-doer. The nation that would adopt a thoroughgoing policy of non-violent resistance would disarm its enemies and lead the way out of the darkening circle of war breeding war. Until that day comes, the pacifist must show the way. He must prove that his pacifism is not weakness, or cowardice, or a way of escape from sharing the burdens of common suffering and peril and death, but a heroic and Christian way to deal with evil. . . To be a Christian pacifist does not mean to be passive in the presence of evil nor submissive to evil men. It does not mean the surrender of the American heritage to whatever invader may have designs upon our liberties. It does mean a vigorous, heroic, sacrificial resistance to wrong, that at the same time seeks to awaken the nobility that lies sleeping but not dead in the breast of the wrong-doer. It means faith that humanity has in it a capacity for response to good and that God will reinforce the appeal which love makes to that capacity. It means a consecration to the unrelenting purpose not to be overcome with evil, but to overcome evil with good.

Dr. George A. Buttrick, President of the Federal Council of Churches, has appointed a committee to study the problem of the conscientious objector. Its chairman is Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Methodist. Other members are Bishop William Remington, Episcopal, Dr. William B. Pugh, Presbyterian, Mr. John H. Warnhuis, Reformed Church, Dr. L. W. McCreary, Disciples, Dr. Douglas Horton, Congregational and Christian, Dr. Charles E. Schaeffer, Evangelical and Reformed, and Dr. Robert A. Ashworth, Baptist.

The Southern California-Arizona Methodist Conference, at its recent meeting, set forth the pacifist position on war and peace with such uncompromising vigor that the official statement was denounced by certain newspapers as "disloyal" and "seditious." We have been unable to secure the full statement, but discover in *Zion's Herald* a report that the Conference advised conscientious objectors, who were supported in their right to refuse war service, "to *discipline themselves* in the realization of world community; to regard nobody as alien, but everybody as a brother, so that in the event of invasion they can treat the invader as brother, not as enemy, and by their brotherhood conquer his belligerence, convince him of his error, right his wrong, make him at last a friend."

The Christian Pacifist Fellowship of England announces a Conference on the Isle of Wight from August 17th to 24th on the subject of "Christian Pacifism: Its Theological and Moral Basis." This Conference is advertised in a half-page advertisement in the June issue of the *Christian Pacifist* (London).

To the Conquerors

The issue is not decided on the battlefield,
In spite of clamorous drums and hoisted flags;
Nor is the judgment of the Almighty Father
Far off in time, or far away in space.
The cries of the bereaved rip like twisted bayonets
Through the bowels of the oppressors,
Starving children sign their death warrant,
And tears of the afflicted fall like hammered nails
Upon the coffin-lids of the victorious.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE.

Correspondence

Jenkin Lloyd Jones and the Present Editor

Editor of UNITY:

In your answer to Albert C. Wilkinson in your issue of July 1, you are evading the main contention, and you are trying to confuse the debate,—something I have known you to do only on two subjects: Prohibition and Pacifism. On all other matters your logic is clear, your arguments consistent, so much so that it is a pleasure to read anything you write, —for you approach all other subjects with reason and emotion in due proportion. On these two themes, however, you permit your emotions to get the best of your reasoning powers, and as I have studied you for a great many years, I know that your reasoning powers are developed mighty strong.

The main contention of Mr. Wilkinson was: what you would have done had you been Washington or Lincoln. This you ignored, which, examined psychologically (I mean considering your psychology), can readily be understood, and you tried to make something out of an incidental remark. But as long as you did so, let me take that up, viz., what would Jenkin Lloyd Jones do if he were editing UNITY today? It must be over 50 years since I first came in contact with Mr. Jones, and as for 42 years I was a constant contributor to the columns of the *Reform Advocate*, founded by Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch, a close friend of Mr. Jones (at one time UNITY and the *Reform Advocate* were published together, in fact, these two publications stood very much for the same principles), I was in touch with Mr. Jones for many, many years, admiring his liberal and broadminded views, just as I do yours. I remember when Mr. Jones hoisted the Stars and Stripes bordered all around by white strips as a peace flag, only it was not over Abraham Lincoln Centre, but over his summer home somewhere in Wisconsin, and I also remember when the Wilson government made him haul it down.

But the issue in those days was an entirely different one from the one we are confronted with today. At that time the Allies were the aggressors, and we had no business to enter into the war. We did not fight then for a just cause. Today, a bandit is attempting to conquer the world. Suppose a burglar had entered the homes of your neighbors, had robbed one house after another, not only of their material belongings but of their cultural values, and had made the inhabitants of those homes his slaves, do you think Mr. Jones would have unfurled the peace flag? I think I knew him as well as you did, and I am willing to vouch for it that he would not have waited until the bandit came to our home, but would have made preparations to defend our home against him, and if possible capture him and turn him over to justice.

Pacifism is a beautiful doctrine among people of honesty and high ideals; it becomes a curse when applied to criminals and people of ruthless, savage, depraved characters. And knowing Mr. Jones as well as I did, I am sure that the peace he longed for in 1916 would not prevent him from trying to nab the one man who is enemy No. 1 of all humanity, culture, liberty, and enlightenment.

Chicago, Illinois. LEO KAUL.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Editor of UNITY:

As I turned to the last page of UNITY (July 1, 1940) and read Albert C. Wilkinson's letter, I was filled with amazement. It simply doesn't make sense! If Mr. Wilkinson has read UNITY for more than thirty years, he must have read it during Jenkin Lloyd Jones' lifetime, and I marvel that he thinks John Haynes Holmes' attitude toward war different in any way from Jenkin Lloyd Jones'.

For about twenty years I had very close contact with Mr. Jones and his charming intellectual wife (formerly Mrs. Edith Lackersteen). Their attitude during the War of 1914-1918 deepened, if possible, my respect and admiration for them both. They were pro-peace and anti-war during that time, just as they were before the war.

I was in position (being a Trustee of Abraham Lincoln Centre of which Mr. Jones was pastor) to see the beginnings of his heroic tragedy. The news that he desired to go on the Ford Peace Ship was a great surprise to most of his Board of Trustees, and it met with the disapproval of several members of the Board. Later, (as Mr. Wilkinson must certainly recall) UNITY was suppressed—or to put it more accurately, denied the service of the mails.

Does Mr. Wilkinson know why? Let him turn to the last UNITIES mailed before Jenkin Lloyd Jones' death. How could Mr. Wilkinson (if he read his UNITY with any discrimination) fail to realize that UNITY was suppressed because (and only because) it advocated *peace*? When America came into the war, the dissatisfaction amongst some of the Trustees increased. Why? Because their sons or brothers or friends had donned a uniform and had gone (or were on the way) to fight for "democracy," God forgive the word!

I can have some understanding of this attitude from the older members of the Board—but from the younger members, none. Here were men who had grown up under Jenkin Lloyd Jones' influence; men, who, until war was declared, apparently agreed with Mr. Jones, and taught their children the same principles. What a difference donning a uniform made—but not to Mr. or Mrs. Jones! To them, right was right—and wrong was wrong—whether a war was on or not.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones' health broke. I think his heart broke. Greatly as I missed my friend, I felt almost relieved that he did not live to see the peace—that Versailles Treaty—which brought on this war. But, if he had lived, I assure Mr. Wilkinson and all others who may have read UNITY with so little understanding, that Mr. Jones would have continued the same attitude. He was and would be a devout adherent of Peace and a devout opponent of War! Were he here, he would still work for Peace and, in spite of the chaos, his voice would still be heard. Thank God, there is, even now, a small band, which would still glory in his uprightness and his courage.

After Mr. Jones' death and the close of the war, Francis Neilson and John Haynes Holmes edited UNITY. Both men believed, and still believe, in peace, and many were the articles published on this subject in this paper.

HELEN SWIFT NEILSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Editor of UNITY:

Anent Albert C. Wilkinson's complaint and your answer to it in the July 1 UNITY, your answer is entirely adequate, but some additional data from my own experience may not be amiss. Through fifty years of constant reading of UNITY, I have found that one of the issues on which you and Jenkin Lloyd Jones have ever been in essentially complete accord is the war-peace issue. Also that you and he have been equally frank and faithful in keeping UNITY readers fully informed as to your pacifist attitude.

Furthermore, I know of Dr. Jones' thoroughgoing pacifism from having spent five summers at Tower Hill, Wisconsin, from 1902 to 1908. While there I was a constant attendant of the summer school in which Dr. Jones taught classes in religion and in literature. Both subjects gave ample opportunity for discussing the war-peace issue, and you may be sure Dr. Jones fully availed himself of that opportunity. He left no doubt in our minds that he considered war itself a greater evil than any evil it sought to remedy. He was strong for total disarmament, "de-horning" he called it, and he thought the United States should lead in this. Many times during those Tower Hill summers he said to us in the class room that he believed our country should not wait for other nations to agree on disarmament, but that we ought to disarm completely right now; that we could safely do so because the moral effect of such a course on our part would be so tremendous that no nation would even consider attacking us, but doubtless they would eventually follow our example. I do not recall whether he ever said this in UNITY, but think he did. If so, however, Mr. Wilkinson either did not read it or failed to understand it.

As to Lincoln, it was Jenkin Lloyd Jones who recommended to us Ernest Crosby's book *Garrison the Non-resistant*, in which are so clearly and convincingly set forth the reasons why the Union could and would have been saved eventually without fighting the Civil War, saved through economic necessity resulting from the industrial revolution, which made slave labor unprofitable. Dr. Jones agreed with this conclusion, even though as a boy of sixteen his ardent desire for negro freedom had led him to enlist in that war.

Finally, I doubt if many shared the present editor's doubt that he could worthily succeed the former editor of UNITY. We felt sure the right man had been chosen. Occasionally I

disagree with something in a Holmes' editorial, and write him to that effect. But if there is any other person who in ability, honesty, courage, consecration, social vision, and opinions on vital issues can better keep UNITY up to its lifelong high standards I do not know who it is.

MARGARET T. OLMSTEAD.

Excelsior, Minn.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Editor of UNITY:

It is always a pleasure to meet in your columns an admirer of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, especially when he has read UNITY for thirty years. One can but wonder what thirty years Mr. Wilkinson read UNITY, certainly not the last thirty years of Mr. Jones' life. He then was as uncompromising a pacifist as is Mr. Holmes now, for the same reasons, plus the fact that Mr. Jones had served in the Civil War and spoke from experience.

One might suppose from the letter of criticism that Dr. Holmes, Hitler-like, had seized UNITY for his selfish desires and parade ground. The facts are that UNITY was and had been in the care of a Board of nine men and women, who had been carefully selected from among men and women who had worked with Mr. Jones before, during, and after that first World War. They had given their best thought, their time and money to keep UNITY going in the interest of Freedom, Fellowship, and Character in Religion. Anyone has a right to boast of keeping a magazine, however small, going in such a cause. With Mr. Jones' unexpected death, that Board realized it had a great responsibility. They acted deliberately, carefully, and thoughtfully. They knew that Mr. Jones admired and loved a young minister in New York. Mr. Jones had made them acquainted with John Haynes Holmes in the columns of UNITY, in his pulpit, in lectures about interracial and international affairs. They knew Mr. Holmes' religion was based on freedom and fellowship, that the character he stood for came to its finest flowering in the same sort of environment Mr. Jones stood for. So it was but natural that they turned to John Haynes Holmes to carry on the task that Mr. Jones had relinquished, a task he loved most among his heavy duties.

Though Mr. Holmes was even then overburdened as a preacher, lecturer, writer, leader in many attempts to bring about fair and just understanding between races and groups, we dared ask him to take on the Editorship of UNITY. For Mr. Jones' sake he finally agreed, and the Board was grateful, for we believed then, as those who are still left, this side the great unknown, believe, that John Haynes Holmes is the one best fitted to carry on UNITY as Mr. Jones wished.

Mr. Jones suffered greatly from the horror of the world war of 1914-18. The merry twinkle departed from those humanity-loving blue eyes. We all hunted every place for something amusing and found it in a most unexpected place, the U. S. Post Office. It was thrust upon us by a small man all puffed up with his own importance and ignorance. UNITY was the cause of his amusing conclusions. The first thing to arouse his suspicion and condemnation was the Beatitudes on the cover page. When called to task, Mr. Jones tried to explain that the Beatitudes were from the Bible, the reported sayings of Jesus, beautiful and helpful. "That is what YOU say, never saw that stuff in any Bible I ever read [he had never gotten beyond, if even that far, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth]. Cut that sort of thing, or your paper will be forbidden the use of the mails."

The next offense came when the Reverend W. C. Gannett sought to explain why he, a lifelong pacifist, could not agree with his "dear friend Jones." Dear, gentle, loving and beloved Mr. Gannett could not be very warlike. We smiled as we read and were not surprised that that great wise guardian of 100% patriotism came down on UNITY like a ton of bricks. No use for Mr. Jones to tell him that it was really an attempt to justify the entrance of the United States in the war to save democracy. That guardian of freedom knew better. So Mr. Gannett went, with the second issue, to join the Beatitudes. The third and unforgivable "bit of anti-war propaganda" was a review of the Browning class consideration of Sordello. "You have been warned twice to cut out that pacifist stuff in your paper." No need to tell the postoffice representative that Browning was a great English poet, dead many years; he knew better, and decreed that no paper with anything from that man Browning should have the freedom of the U. S. mails. So Browning carried another issue of UNITY to join the Beatitudes and Mr. Gannett's reasons why Democracy called and we should answer.

UNITY continued to get out its weekly issue, all carefully locked up to go to the subscribers with those doubtful three, when they were released after the War was over and we could laugh once more. Mr. Jones kept the correspondence to amuse the subscribers and make them wonder, as he did, how it often happens that such stuffed shirts get in places of power in wartime.

If Mr. Wilkinson will again subscribe for UNITY and read it, I am sure, if he loved and admired Jenkin Lloyd Jones, he will find John Haynes Holmes an editor as broadminded, as fair to opponents, as patriotic, as farseeing, as humble and truly religious as was Mr. Jones.

ONE OF THE NINE.

A Friend Is Through

Editor of UNITY:

Please cancel my subscription and do not send the magazine, called UNITY, to me any more.

I feel that the very name of your magazine has now come to be a misnomer. There is no room in this country, certainly not on my study desk, for a publication which persists in a peace-at-any price policy. What your policy really amounts to, expressed in one word, is pro-Hitlerism.

Is the universal establishment of Hitlerism your purpose? Anyone should realize that one of the best ways of assuring success to Hitler, would be the particular brand of pacifism which your so-called UNITY seems to stand for. One look at the plight of England and France of today should make your magazine nauseating to anyone who holds a few memories and understands a few facts.

For more than ten years I have been a subscriber to your magazine. Whether you realize it or not, a new and horrible tragedy has befallen the world. Pacifism, among the victims and prospective victims, has helped bring about this tragedy.

I cannot wish success to you.

Chicago, Illinois. GEORGE W. TURNER.

[Note: We are sorry to have Mr. Turner leave us, but stand amazed that he could read UNITY for ten years and not know where we stand on the war and peace question. What does Mr. Turner think—that we cherish ideals in easy times, only to throw them overboard when hard times come and these ideals are most needed? What is pacifism for, if not to meet the challenge of war? We see the present horror just as Mr. Turner does, and we are as much opposed to Hitlerism as he is. But these things are themselves the fruit of war, and continuance of war can only bring final havoc. The pacifist has a better way, as the early Christian had a better way in Rome in the days of the barbarian invasions, and he proposes to follow it, lest all be lost.

As for the very name of this magazine being "a misnomer," let us say that when we can no longer proclaim and preach the Unity of Mankind, that "God hath made of one all nations of men," then Hitler will indeed be triumphant.—*Editor.*]

Christian Principles

Editor of UNITY:

A great deal has been written and spoken about the policy of a Christian nation in these critical days. I am increasingly convinced that the only thing that can save the world in this crisis is the application of the principles of Christ to international problems—and these principles do not include aid to either side in a war.

The world has waited for two thousand years for a nation imbued with faith, courage, and vision enough to try the Christian way. If this country, instead of piling up the tools of destruction, were to use her billions to bring relief to the suffering and to help rebuild the devastated areas in all the war-torn countries of Europe and Asia, and her statesmanship (without grinding any axes of her own) to help work out some of the problems that can never be settled by war, she would earn the love and respect of all the world and blaze the trail to that new world that we are all seeking, where life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness shall be the right of all and not merely of a chosen few.

In my opinion this is the only policy that a Christian nation can adopt, and I believe moreover that it would be a more sure defense than the weapons of war can ever be.

KATHLEEN W. SAYRE.

Orangeburg, N. Y.